

May 6, 1983

LR 149 - 155
LB 618, 146

Chronister voting no. Senator Beyer voting no. Senator Richard Peterson voting no. Senator Vickers voting yes. Senator Jacobson voting no.

SPEAKER NICHOL: A roll call has been asked for. Senator Kahle is here so proceed. Excuse me, Mr. Clerk, we are voting on the suspension of the rules.

CLERK: (Roll call vote taken. See page 2058, Legislative Journal.) 21 ayes, 17 nays, Mr. President.

SPEAKER NICHOL: The motion fails. Yes, read something in.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Pirsch would like to print amendments to 146.

I have study resolutions, LR 149 by Senator Pirsch concerning the study of mental health experts and the role of psychiatric testimony in criminal cases; 150 by Senator Hoagland, study and evaluate the current method of handling child custody and child support cases; 151 by Senator Johnson calls for a study on restrictive rental practices in Nebraska; 152 by the Ag Committee would call for a study to give guidance to the Ag and Environment Committee on fees by the Public Service Commission, other related items; 153 by the Ag and Environment Committee, examine commodity boards and marketing processes of the Department of Ag; 154 by Ag and Environment calls for a study by the Ag and Environment Committee on the marketing of grain and related areas; 155 by Senator Hoagland and Beutler is a study to review the increase in the amount of violence and lawlessness of extremist hate groups. Those will be laid over, Mr. President, or referred to the Exec Board, excuse me.

Mr. President, the next motion I have on 618 is a motion by Senators Wesely and Warner to suspend Rule 7, Section 3 and permit consideration of the Warner amendment found on page 1612 of the Journal.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, this is to take up the amendment to 612, excuse me, 618. It is found on page 1612 of the Journal and this one does not include the provisions of 611. It does not include two things that the previous amendment did and that is the optional services would remain as the law now requires that all of them must be provided; and secondly, this amendment does not contain the authorization for optional eligibility requirements that was in the first one, both of which I suspect are more controversial than what is in this amendment. So